

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF INDIANA
FORT WAYNE DIVISION**

PARAGON STEEL ENTERPRISES, LLC,)	
)	
Plaintiff,)	
)	
v.)	CAUSE NO. 1:09-CV-278
)	
INFODATA CORPORATION,)	
)	
Defendant.)	

OPINION AND ORDER

This case was removed to this Court from the DeKalb Superior Court by Defendant based on diversity jurisdiction pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1332(a). (Docket # 2.) The Notice of Removal alleges that Plaintiff Paragon Steel, LLC’s members are residents of Indiana. (Notice of Removal ¶ 1.) Defendant’s jurisdictional allegations, however, inadequately set forth Plaintiff’s citizenship.

The “residency” of a party is meaningless for purposes of diversity jurisdiction, as “citizenship is what matters.”¹ *Guar. Nat’l Title Co. v. J.E.G. Assocs.*, 101 F.3d 57, 58-59 (7th Cir. 1996) (explaining that statements concerning a party’s “residency” are not proper allegations of citizenship as required by 28 U.S.C. § 1332); *see* 28 U.S.C. § 1332; *Nilssen v. Motorola, Inc.*, 255 F.3d 410, 412 (7th Cir. 2001). “It is well-settled that when the parties allege residence but not citizenship, the court must dismiss the suit.” *Held v. Held*, 137 F.3d 998, 1000

¹ For purposes of determining diversity jurisdiction, each party’s citizenship must be articulated as of “the time of the filing of the complaint,” rather than the date the claims are alleged to have arisen or some other time material to the lawsuit. *Multi-M Int’l, Inc. v. Paige Med. Supply Co.*, 142 F.R.D. 150, 152 (N.D. Ill. 1992); *see Denlinger v. Brennan*, 87 F.3d 214, 216 (7th Cir. 1996).

Furthermore, “[a]llegations of federal subject matter jurisdiction may not be made on the basis of information and belief, only personal knowledge.” *Yount v. Shashek*, 472 F. Supp. 2d 1055, 1057 n.1 (S.D. Ill. 2006); *see also Bankers Trust Co. v. Old Republic Ins. Co.*, 959 F.2d 677, 683-84 (7th Cir. 1992).

(7th Cir. 1998) (internal quotation marks and citation omitted)); *see generally Smoot*, 469 F.3d at 677-78.

Moreover, a limited liability company's citizenship "for purposes of . . . diversity jurisdiction is the citizenship of its members." *Cosgrove v. Bartolotta*, 150 F.3d 729, 731 (7th Cir. 1998). Therefore, the Court must be advised of the citizenship of *each* member of Paragon Steel, LLC to ensure that none of its members share a common citizenship with Defendant. *See Hicklin Eng'g, L.C. v. Bartell*, 439 F.3d 346, 347 (7th Cir. 2006). Moreover, citizenship must be "traced through multiple levels" for those members of Paragon Steel, LLC who are themselves a partnership or a limited liability company, as anything less can result in a dismissal or remand for want of jurisdiction. *Mut. Assignment & Indem. Co. v. Lind-Waldock & Co., LLC*, 364 F.3d 858, 861 (7th Cir. 2004).

Therefore, the Defendant is ORDERED to file an amended Notice of Removal forthwith, properly alleging the citizenship of each member of Paragon Steel, LLC and, if necessary, tracing the citizenship of unincorporated associations through all applicable layers of ownership.

SO ORDERED.

Enter for October 15, 2009.

/S/ Roger B. Cosbey
Roger B. Cosbey,
United States Magistrate Judge